



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,500	08/04/2006	Takaaki Miyoshi	1962.1001	9218
21171	7590	06/12/2009	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			MULLS, JEFFREY C	
SUITE 700			ART UNIT	
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/588,500

Applicant(s)

MIYOSHI, TAKAAKI

Examiner

Jeffrey C. Mullis

Art Unit

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8-4-06; 8-28-08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-14 and 17 and the species of triblock copolymers, polyamide 6,6 and carbon in the reply filed on 5-18-09 is acknowledged.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa et al. (either US 2004/0157978 or WO 02/0094936) in view of Kusano et al. (US 5,616,652).

The primary reference '978 (equivalent to WO '936) discloses a composition containing all of applicants components (abstract). Note paragraph 105 for use of a polyamide/conductive carbon fiber masterbatch.

Kusano et al. discloses a styrenic block copolymer (SBC) having a bulk density of 0.18 or more (abstract), measured by filling a cylinder and dropping it (column 8, lines 33-44), a process which would inherently pack the material. The material may be added to thermoplastic resins such as PPO and polyamide at column 7, lines 30-69. Benefits of using the block copolymers are improved handling, high capability to absorb softener, and thorough melting upon mixing (column 2, lines 5-10). Note also that paragraphs 2 and 3 of applicant's published specification discloses that low productivity/feed rate was

a problem known in the art at the time of the invention for blending styrenic block copolymers.

The primary reference does not disclose that the SBC used has applicants packed bulk density.

It would have been obvious to a practitioner having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the SBC of the secondary reference in place of the SBC of the primary reference in the expectation of advantages such as improved handling, ability to absorb softener, more thorough mixing and higher productivity, absent any showing of surprising or unexpected results.

Claims 1-14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusano et al. (US 5,616,652), cited above in view of Miyoshi (US 2003/0139518).

The secondary reference, Miyoshi discloses a composition containing SBC, polyamide, conductive filler and PPO (claims 5-9) and in which a polyamide/conductive filler may be used as a masterbatch (paragraph 119).

Kusano does not disclose any examples in which all of applicants materials are present in combination. However, the goal of Kusano is to improve other processes in which macromolecular materials are melt blended with SBC and especially those containing PPO or polyamide. Hence it would have been obvious to a practitioner having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the non SBC components of the secondary reference to the primary reference since doing so would improve the process of the secondary reference as desired by the primary reference absent any showing of surprising or unexpected results.

Art Unit: 1796

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey C. Mullis
M-F, 9-5 pm at telephone number 571 272 1075.

Jeffrey C. Mullis
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796

/Jeffrey C. Mullis/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796